

“To write usefully about Intentional Communities, one must have a sense for their importance to the world, beyond the specific service of each one. As personal biographies weave a picture of a community, so an overview of many community histories reveals the contribution of this quiet movement to that healthy cultural diversity on which human evolution depends (as does world ecology on biological diversity). The chronicler not only reminds busy communitarians of each other, and of the vital role of their whole movement; he/she must also integrate the economic, social, and spiritual insights of Intentional Community into a larger society struggling toward its global future. By comparing two ‘communities of communities,’ Dan McKanan, who shows rare empathy and aptitude for accurate recording, has produced what is hopefully the first of many parts of his chronicle.”

Helen Zipperlen
Camphill Village Kimberton Hills
Kimberton, Pennsylvania

“Catholic Worker, Ammon Hennacy, remarked that while he might not be able to change the world, he was certain the world would not change him. With a refreshing and critical eye, Dan McKanan explores this idea of change by introducing us to the lives and roots of several Catholic Worker and Camphill communities. The challenging question is about change. Does the gentle personalism and radical philosophy of the Worker and ‘threefolding’ and ‘curative education’ concepts of Camphill have any effect on changing our ‘filthy rotten system’? Dan McKanan asks the right questions for the right reasons.”

Brendan Walsh
Co-Founder, Viva House
Baltimore Catholic Worker

Touching the World

Christian Communities
Transforming Society

Dan McKanan



LITURGICAL PRESS
Collegeville, Minnesota

www.litpress.org

Scripture selections are taken from the *New American Bible*. Copyright © 1991, 1986, 1970 by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, 3211 Fourth Street, NE, Washington, DC 20017-1194 and are used by license of the copyright owner. All rights reserved. No part of the *New American Bible* may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the copyright owner.

Cover design by David Manahan, O.S.B. Photo courtesy of iStockphoto.com, Oleg Prikhodko.

© 2007 by Order of Saint Benedict, Collegeville, Minnesota. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, microfilm, microfiche, mechanical recording, photocopying, translation, or by any other means, known or yet unknown, for any purpose except brief quotations in reviews, without the previous written permission of Liturgical Press, Saint John's Abbey, P.O. Box 7500, Collegeville, Minnesota 56321-7500. Printed in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

McKanan, Dan, 1967–

Touching the world : Christian communities transforming society /
by Dan McKanan.

p. cm.

ISBN-13: 978-0-8146-3175-1

ISBN-10: 0-8146-3175-4

1. Christian communities. 2. Community—Religious aspects—
Christianity. I. Title.

BV4405.M39 2007

267:182—dc22

2006013850

Contents

1. Introducing the Communities 1
 2. Crafting Vocation 36
 3. Making Room for Families 65
 4. Keeping the Faith 95
 5. Dying and Rising 125
- Acknowledgments 157
- Learning More about Camphill and the Catholic Worker 161

Introducing the Communities

Camphill is a beacon for all on the path toward social renewal. Its fundamental ideals light the way to a better future—a future where the work of healing the earth unites with the work of healing social life—where people’s needs are met with love, where equality of opportunity is assured and where the individual spirit unfolds in dignity and freedom.

—*Camphill Village Copake*¹

To foster a society based on creed instead of greed, on systematic unselfishness instead of systematic selfishness, on gentle personalism instead of rugged individualism, is to create a new society within the shell of the old.

—*Peter Maurin*²

It is Saturday morning, and the kitchen at the Des Moines Catholic Worker house is buzzing with activity. Church groups, Grinnell College students, and a pack of Cub Scouts appear at the door to drop off food or help serve the daily meal. There are more volunteers than necessary, but each person has a story to share. An older man, wrestling with the wounds of a recent divorce, wonders if his faith is calling him to a change of lifestyle. A United Parcel Service manager, intrigued that one of his part-time employees is a live-in volunteer at a homeless shelter, peruses the hundreds of newspaper clippings about antiwar demonstrations that line the walls. A high school senior prepares for her trip to the Worker’s sister village in Chiapas, Mexico. A father

discusses anarchist philosophy while his twelve-year-old son plays chess with several homeless men. A college professor, visiting to research a book on intentional communities, is invited into the game and soundly defeated. And holding court at the center of it all is Carla Dawson, who arrived at the Worker as a homeless single mother and is now often described as the community's "franchise player." Carla tells stories, barks orders, stirs soup, and greets each newcomer with a warmth that seems born of lifelong friendship.

Saturdays at Camphill Village Minnesota are usually quieter, but once a year this rural village of eighty people hosts several hundred visitors for its Open Day. Mostly residents of the nearby towns of Sauk Centre and Long Prairie, the visitors are traditional folks who work hard on farms and in offices, spend their free time with their children, and worship regularly at Lutheran or Catholic churches. As they take a hayride through Camphill's fields, the visitors learn about a lifestyle that is both similar to their own and very different. The Camphillers share their love of the land, but their farming is shaped by "biodynamic" principles that forbid the use of chemical pesticides and require that planting and harvesting follow astrological rhythms. Rather than traveling to a distant office, the Camphillers alternate between work shifts in the home, the garden, and traditional craft shops that produce wooden toys, woven rugs, and hearty cookies. Though they work as hard as their neighbors, they receive no individual salaries. Decisions about family vacations or private school tuition must be negotiated with the entire village, though there is usually enough money to go around. Perhaps most importantly, adults with developmental disabilities are at the heart of Camphill life, and on Open Day they are especially eager to show off the community that they have built up. Sarah, who has Down syndrome, rushes about, offering a boisterous hug to everyone she recognizes. Mike, who grew up on a farm just ten miles away, beams with pride as he reports on the calves and baby goats born on the farm this year. Martha rocks back and forth, clutching her Cabbage Patch doll, as she makes a joke about the name of each new person she meets. "Is your name Daniel? Daniel have to tell another joke!"

Touching the World

The Des Moines Catholic Worker and Camphill Village Minnesota, along with the dozens of communities that are like them, can be lifted up as heroic alternatives to competitive, consumerist society, or dismissed as irresponsible utopians who prefer personal purity to social responsibility. But neither of these characterizations does justice to the mixed and mingled

character of life at a Catholic Worker house or a Camphill village. It is true that Camphillers and Catholic Workers live in ways that are different from those of their neighbors, sometimes heroically so. But Catholic Workers and Camphillers also live *with* their neighbors. They worship together, serve together on school boards, share vegetables and political opinions and gossip. Community members are eager to share the insights they have gleaned from cooperative living, but they are also willing to learn from their neighbors. And it is in this living together that Christian intentional communities can do the most to instill values of cooperation, equality, and love in society as a whole.

This book begins from a simple premise: a Christian intentional community can be a transformative presence in the world only if it touches the world. Throughout history, many Christians (and others) have sought to build “the kingdom of God on earth”—to forge an alternative to the violence, inequality, and fragmentation of mainstream society. In the face of militarism, industrialism, and greed, small Christian communities have lifted up such values as sharing of possessions, gentle care for vulnerable persons and for the earth, and cooperative work that honors the special gifts of each individual. But creating the alternative is only the first step. In order to make the alternative meaningful, a community must resist the temptation to cut itself off from “the world.” It must be flexible enough to stay connected to the persons and institutions that comprise “the world,” even as it calls them (and itself) to ongoing transformation. Christian communities should, in other words, build bridges rather than walls, opening their boundaries so that they can share their own gifts and receive the gifts of others.

The task of building bridges is difficult and risky. Indeed, communities that choose to build walls between themselves and the world can reap enormous benefits. They have a clear sense of who they are and why they are superior to their neighbors. Their members are highly motivated to stay in the community for fear of being cast out into a hostile world. One influential study has shown that communities that maintain high boundaries—for example by using distinctive language and clothing to limit contact with outsiders—are more likely to survive for multiple generations.³ The cost of such practices, however, is that at best these communities benefit only the handful of individuals who are willing to make a total break from the world. At worst, their isolation allows authoritarianism and abuse of power to flourish unchecked, sometimes culminating in sexual exploitation or the tragedy of Jonestown. When these tragedies are publicized, they reinforce the perception that the ideals of the Gospel are meant only for heaven. Meanwhile, other,

quieter communities go about the hard work of connecting Gospel ideals to the values and practices of people in mainstream society.

I have chosen two movements to illustrate the practices of touching the world. Camphill is a worldwide network of schools and villages in which persons with and without developmental disabilities share life together, usually in an agricultural setting. It was founded by Karl König, a physician and a student of Rudolf Steiner's esoteric Christianity, who had fled with a group of friends from Hitler's Austria to an estate in Scotland. Like Camphill, the Catholic Worker movement emerged during the worldwide social crisis of the 1930s. Founded in New York City by Dorothy Day and Peter Maurin, the movement has grown to encompass nearly two hundred urban "houses of hospitality," rural farming communes, and associated ventures. The two movements have exercised little direct influence on one another; indeed, few Camphillers or Catholic Workers are even aware of the other movement. Yet they are similar in their concern for social renewal, their flexible approach to membership, their inclusion of families as well as single people, their attempt to preserve a communal Christian identity without imposing any orthodoxy on individual members, and their openness to the experiences of death and resurrection that are sometimes the consequence of their other values. These common practices provide multiple points of contact with the larger society.

Just as individual Camphill and Catholic Worker communities maintain open and flexible boundaries with the larger society, so each movement taken as a whole has a boundary that is difficult to define. Karl König declared that "the Camphill Movement is no trade-mark" and that "anyone can call himself a part of it," though he added that the "council of the Movement may have to consider whether such an assertion is right or wrong."⁴ The Catholic Worker has never had such a council; it is literally true that any group of people can "join" simply by declaring their community to be part of the movement. Each movement, moreover, maintains close ties to a variety of free-standing communities that decline to affiliate formally—often because they hope that independence will facilitate close ties to the larger society. Such communities play an important part in my story, though I draw examples or quotations from them only when I am confident that comparable examples could also be drawn from the "official" communities.

Both the flexible boundaries of these movements and the comparative nature of my study create certain terminological challenges. I refer to Camphill and the Catholic Worker as "intentional community movements," and to the constituent groups of each movement as "intentional communities." But most Camphillers refer to their local communities as "schools," "villages," or

simply “Camphill places,” reserving the term “Camphill Community” for the inner circle of individuals who have made a lifelong commitment to sustaining the ideals of Camphill. Catholic Workers often point out that their houses of hospitality cannot be called “intentional communities” because so many of their residents are there out of need rather than conscious intention. “I myself have often thought of our communities,” wrote Dorothy Day in 1964, “as concentration camps of displaced people, all of whom want community, but at the same time want privacy, a little log cabin of their own, to grow their own food, cultivate their own gardens and seek for sanctity in their own way.”⁵

I have retained the phrase “intentional community” because its meanings, in contemporary usage, are so loose that it can function as a convenient umbrella. At both Camphill and the Catholic Worker, people who are not related by marriage or blood share living space, meals, daily work, and/or service on a regular basis, even if not all the people associated with each movement share all of these things. As such, they fit into a broader culture of intentional communities that includes many other groups that I might have included in this study. The LArche movement, founded by Jean Vanier in the 1960s, is similar to Camphill in its choice of work and to the Catholic Worker in its spiritual underpinnings. A number of freestanding Protestant communities, including Sojourners, Koinonia, Jubilee Partners, Reba Place, and Iona, have combined community sharing, family life, care for the earth, and passionate advocacy of social justice. The Christian practices of bridge-building that I celebrate are also exemplified by “engaged Buddhist” communities, by spiritually eclectic communities such as Findhorn and Sirius, and by many secular communes and cohousing communities. The Fellowship for Intentional Community works hard to help this broader spectrum of communities “touch the world” by sponsoring conferences and publishing a popular directory. And though Catholic monastic communities (including those that sponsor the colleges where I teach) do not embrace the specific bridge-building practices I will discuss, they have their own ways of touching the world. They sponsor colleges and hospitals, welcome persons of many faiths into their oblate or associate programs, and celebrate liturgies that bend the hierarchy’s rules toward greater hospitality.

My choice to focus on certain movements and not on others is largely the product of circumstance. When I began teaching at Saint John’s University and the College of Saint Benedict, I consulted the Fellowship for Intentional Community’s directory to find communities in my neighborhood, and thus got to know Camphill Village Minnesota. That community has remained

at the center of my research efforts, graciously allowing me to live with them for four extended stays as well as many shorter visits. I first got to know the Catholic Worker through the Saint Catherine of Genoa house of hospitality in Chicago, where I volunteered weekly while in graduate school. Saint John's and Saint Ben's have sent a remarkable number of alums to the Worker movement, and these individuals have provided links to houses of hospitality and farms throughout the Midwest. My analysis of Camphill and Catholic Worker communities has also been shaped by my ongoing research on similar communities rooted in the Transcendentalist and abolitionist movements of the nineteenth century. This comparative perspective has persuaded me that the world-touching practices found in Camphill and the Catholic Worker can not be traced to their unique circumstances, but represent a viable path for Christians of many times, places, and denominations.

My research method has been eclectic. Over the course of about five years, I visited around twenty Camphill, Catholic Worker, and informally affiliated communities, participating in daily life and interviewing a cross section of residents. In my interviews, I rarely tried to identify the most important leaders or even the most dedicated members, preferring to gain insights from the full spectrum of short- and long-term residents who make up these communities at any given time. I did not, however, attempt to obtain a statistically random sample. I have sought additional insights from the interviewees by sharing article and section drafts with them, and offering them the opportunity to clarify or expand on their quoted comments. I also offered interviewees the choice to be quoted either anonymously or by name. When they did not express a preference, and when no sensitive material was involved, I have quoted them by name as a way of honoring their personal contributions to the communitarian project. I supplemented my own participant observation with a wide reading of secondary sources, archival material, and movement periodicals. I have not, however, attempted a comprehensive study of either movement, and am thus deeply indebted to the more detailed studies of previous scholars.

Though I would not identify myself as a "Catholic Worker" or a "Camphiller," I have made no attempt to adopt the stance of the neutral social scientist. I was trained as a theologian and church historian, and as a result I see my own scholarly vocation as that of a critical insider—one who offers new analyses and insights from the perspective of a fundamental commitment. In this particular case, my fundamental commitment is as a Christian communitarian. I believe that Christians should be about the work of building communities that both challenge and connect with the larger society. I

have chosen to lift up two movements that share this ideal and that, in my view, often succeed in realizing it. I can imagine myself joining either movement; if I could not imagine this, I would not have chosen to write about them. At the same time, the picture I offer of Camphill and the Catholic Worker will not be a simple mirror of the accounts offered by movement leaders and participants. Such accounts often stress the movement's uniqueness, its fidelity to its ideals, and the heroism of its founders, while I will accent similarities with other movements, flexibility of practices, and the ordinariness of most participants. My intent is not to downgrade the movements, but to uncover the complex process by which lofty idealism is translated into transformative presence in the world. By praising these communities for characteristics they do not always find praiseworthy, I hope to challenge them to a deeper and more creative engagement with the wider human community.

The bulk of this book will be devoted to the specific practices that allow Catholic Worker and Camphill communities to touch the world. In chapter 2, I will consider ways communities have adapted or even changed their missions in order to allow members to follow distinctive callings, with particular emphasis on the experiences of short-term community members and the "extended community" of people who participate in the life of an intentional community without giving up their place in the larger society. In chapter 3, I will identify the practices that allow people to build family and community relationships simultaneously. Chapter 4 will consider practices that allow communities to maintain their Christian identities without compromising the spiritual freedom of the diverse individuals who are drawn to their work. In chapter 5, finally, I will seek to come to terms with the short lifespans of some of the communities in this study by identifying the practices that keep them open to the possibility not only of death, but also of resurrection. To set the stage for these explorations, however, I must briefly tell the stories of each movement.

The Catholic Worker

"It all happened while we sat there talking, and it is still going on," wrote Dorothy Day in the conclusion to her autobiography. Indeed, Catholic Workers of every generation have loved to talk, and a favorite topic is the formative myth of how Day, a bohemian journalist, and Peter Maurin, a French eccentric, came together to start a movement that would put the ideals of the Sermon on the Mount into concrete practice. Born at the turn of the twentieth century, Day was raised largely without religious faith and spent her

young adulthood as a socialist journalist. What she called the “natural happiness” of becoming a mother drew her to the Catholic Church, which appealed to her as the spiritual home of “the great mass of the poor.” Since her common-law husband was a devout atheist, she broke off the marriage in order to join the church and have her daughter Tamar baptized, then sought to connect her old and new lives by writing on social issues for the lay Catholic journal *Commonweal*. Through *Commonweal*’s editor, she met Peter Maurin, a vagabond intellectual whom she called the “Saint Francis of modern times.” In the third year of the Great Depression, Maurin knocked on her door and began “declaiming” one of the “Easy Essays” that outlined his distinctive interpretation of Catholic social teaching.⁶

Maurin, who was fifty-seven when he met Day, had been born into a huge French peasant family and educated by the Christian Brothers, an order that he briefly joined. Influenced by English “distributists” such as Eric Gill and the “personalism” of Emanuel Mounier, Maurin’s social theory emphasized personal responsibility within a decentralized agrarian economy. While most American Catholics were enthusiastic about Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal, Maurin insisted that the best way to achieve the “common good” was for each person to take individual responsibility for the well-being of his or her neighbors, performing the “works of mercy” that had long been featured in Catholic spirituality. “In our own day,” he complained, “the poor are no longer / fed, clothed and sheltered / at a personal sacrifice, / but at the expense of the taxpayers. / And because the poor / are no longer fed, / clothed and sheltered / the pagans say about the Christians / ‘See how they pass the buck.’” In order to create a society “where it is easier for people to be good,” Maurin proposed a three-part program consisting of “round-table discussions” for “clarification of thought,” “houses of hospitality” in each city or diocese, and, most ambitiously, farming communes that he called “agronomic universities.”⁷

From the beginning, Catholic Workers sought both to expound this ideal and to put it into practice. When Maurin knocked on Dorothy Day’s door, his immediate plan was to launch a newspaper to promote his ideas. This they did quickly, though not without a significant conflict between Day’s penchant for muckraking journalism and Maurin’s preference for a constant republication of his program. Though Maurin withdrew from the editorial board, editor Day continued to publish his Easy Essays and pay homage to his role as intellectual founder. The resulting combination sparked the imaginations of both the young idealists who spent hours hawking the *Catholic Worker* in Union Square and the 100,000 subscribers who were reading the paper by its second anniversary.

The process of implementing Maurin's practical program was more haphazard. Unemployed persons began showing up at the door of the apartment where they were publishing the paper, and personalist principle dictated that they attend to the needs of these persons. Relying on donations from sympathetic priests and newspaper readers, they rented an apartment they dubbed the Teresa-Joseph Co-operative. Within a few years, the community included hospitality houses for both men and women (St. Joseph's House and Maryhouse, respectively) that also provided editorial offices and living space for volunteer editors and cooks. Other associates of the movement lived in nearby apartments, at a series of "garden communes" on Staten Island, or at the larger farm established in Easton, Pennsylvania, in 1936. (Both the houses of hospitality and the farms would change location several times during the ensuing years.) Meanwhile, the fledgling community sponsored a "Catholic Worker School," with topics ranging from racial justice to scholastic theology to Jewish spirituality. By September 1935, a list of "Allied Movements" added cooperatives, unions, maternity guilds, and "legislation for the common good."⁸

This mix of activities appealed to Depression-era Catholics. As Day and Maurin spoke at Catholic universities and parishes, they simultaneously raised money for the work in New York and inspired local people to start their own houses of hospitality or discussion "cells." Jane Marra, a labor organizer in Boston, started a house of hospitality there in 1935. In Saint Louis, a circle of *Worker* readers started the "Campion Book Shop and Propaganda Committee" as an alternative to a nearby communist bookstore, then added a coffee line, a house of hospitality, and a 250-acre farm. In Chicago, an African American Catholic named Arthur Falls was inspired to create a house that emphasized self-help more than the works of mercy: rather than providing soup and shelter, he created a credit union and a lending library of books on cooperatives and race relations. Another Chicago group began publishing their own local paper, though they encouraged readers to spend their first quarter on the New York *Catholic Worker*. By 1941 nearly forty communities sponsored houses in such far-flung cities as Sacramento, Memphis, and London, and farms in Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Massachusetts, and New York.⁹

"Invariably," noted *Worker* historian William Miller, these communities "were examples of Dorothy Day's counsel: begin where you are and with what you have." Day provided them with moral and often financial support, lists of local subscribers to the *Worker*, and free publicity, but each house remained structurally independent, and for the most part Day refused to

impose any organizational, ideological, or theological party line. Beginning with Arthur Falls' "Chicago Letter" of June 1935, the *Worker* published regular updates on local activities, and by November 1937 there was enough activity to fill an entire issue. Day also took pains to remind local groups that "we emphasize again the necessity of smallness. The idea, of course, would be that each Christian, conscious of his duty in the lay apostolate, should take in one of the homeless as an honored guest." This ideal of the "Christ room" in the family home has remained as integral to the movement as houses of hospitality and farming communes.¹⁰

Almost from the beginning, the Catholic Worker coupled its economic radicalism with fervent opposition to war. A 1934 pamphlet entitled *The Catholic Church is Anti-War* opposed both imperialist and class warfare on the basis of the just war criteria, but a few years later an editorial declared more emphatically that "The Catholic Worker is sincerely a *pacifist* paper," adding that "the pacifist in the next war must be ready for martyrdom." The primary context for these declarations of antiwar sentiment was the Spanish Civil War, in which Day's former communist comrades were fervently supporting the Republican side, while many Catholics embraced Franco and the Nationalists as defenders of the church. Some readers who admired the *Worker's* high-minded criticism of both sides were troubled when the paper retained its pacifist commitments in the face of World War II. An editorial in June 1940 contrasted their position with that of Communists who might change with a changing party line: "We consider that we have inherited the Beatitudes and that our duty is clear. The Sermon on the Mount is our Christian manifesto." In the issue immediately following Pearl Harbor, they reiterated the point in almost identical terms: "We are still pacifists. Our manifesto is the Sermon on the Mount, which means that we will try to be peacemakers."¹¹

Though this stance provoked little controversy in New York City, it split the national movement in two. "Until the Pope speaks," editorialized one of the Chicago communities, "it is the right and obligation of every Catholic to form his own conscience on the issue of the war." The house in Seattle began distributing the Chicago paper instead of the New York paper, and the Los Angeles community went so far as to burn copies of the New York *Worker*.¹² Day responded with a circular letter that acknowledged the disagreement but urged those who "take it upon themselves to suppress the paper" to "disassociate themselves from the Catholic Worker movement." (She was more ambiguous about houses that dissented quietly.) "There is no reason," Day added in a more conciliatory note, "why we should not be associated together

as friends and fellow workers, but there is every reason for not continuing to use The Catholic Worker name.”¹³

This surprising (to some) declaration of principle provoked a variety of responses from the local Worker communities. The Chicago paper ceased publishing; the Pittsburgh community separated itself from the movement; the Seattle community separated, then returned after tempers cooled. Other communities scarcely noticed, yet the overall effect of World War II was nearly fatal to the movement. Many houses closed when volunteers enlisted in the army or were sent to conscientious objector camps; others found there was little need for hospitality in a wartime economy with virtually full employment. Half the original thirty-two houses of hospitality had closed by 1943, and only the communities in New York, Detroit, Cleveland, Rochester, and Harrisburg, with their associated farms and one independent farm in Upton, Massachusetts, continued well beyond the end of the war. The Rochester house is the only original Worker community outside New York City that survives today; it broke early from the New York model by accepting nonprofit status, and has rarely been featured prominently in the New York paper.

The fact that the Worker survived at all can be traced to at least two factors. The first is that Dorothy Day retained personal friendships with many of the Workers who disagreed with her, even corresponding with those who enlisted in the military, and was thus able to draw several back into the work following the war. These connections, in turn, allowed Day to soften her own stance. By the time she wrote *The Long Loneliness*, she acknowledged that although the presence of nonpacifists in the Worker “is a matter of grief to me . . . I can see too how good it is that we always have this attitude represented among us. We are not living in an ivory tower.”¹⁴ The second key factor was the annual retreat for Catholic Workers from across the country that Day inaugurated in 1939. In some ways, this exacerbated tensions within the movement: Father John Hugo, who took over responsibility for leading the retreat in 1941, was a fervent pacifist who also struck many Workers as “Jansenist” in his demanding piety. Still, for those who were drawn to Hugo’s spirituality, the experience of a full week each year of silence and scriptural meditation could galvanize commitment to the movement and provide a sense of shared identity to Workers who labored in many far-flung places.

By the 1950s the Catholic Worker had settled into a period of slow growth and maturation, despite the tendency of historians and former Workers to write of the movement as a thing of the past. New houses—some enduring and others less so—appeared in Washington, D.C.; Portland, Oregon; Memphis; Oakland; and even London. The Worker’s close connection to the

Catholic rural life movement inspired many to start new Catholic Worker farms, though most of these could be better described as alternative family farms than as the “agronomic universities” envisioned by Peter Maurin. The New York community, meanwhile, experienced something of an artistic and intellectual renaissance. Ade Bethune began contributing a distinctive style of woodcut to the paper in the 1930s, and after 1949 her efforts were supplemented by those of Fritz Eichenberg, a Jewish Quaker whose depictions of Christ standing in a breadline and of a black man on a cross continue to appear in the New York paper and on the walls of most Worker houses.¹⁵ The newspaper also featured the writings of John Hugo and Robert Ludlow—described as the Worker’s “dominant intellectual presence” between 1946 and 1954—and the more impassioned advocacy of Ammon Hennacy, a Tolstoyan anarchist who stressed the connections between Peter Maurin’s personalism and various radical traditions indigenous to the United States.

Though the Worker had always advocated active “resistance” to war, it was Hennacy who pushed civil disobedience to the center of the Worker’s mission. In 1955 he persuaded Dorothy Day to join him in refusing to participate in the civil defense drills that were an integral part of Cold War policy. Within a few years, New York had canceled its drills, and other Workers were finding new ways to resist. Karl Meyer, son of a Vermont congressman and a convert to Catholicism, was inspired not only to found the Saint Stephen’s Catholic Worker in Chicago, but also to trespass at military installations, join a peace march to Moscow, and publish advice on how to avoid paying the federal income taxes that were used to fund the Cold War. Echoing an article published by John Hugo in the *Catholic Worker* in 1948, Meyer also proposed the burning of draft cards. This tactic caught on during the Vietnam War, as *Worker* editor Tom Cornell burned his draft card at the Polaris nuclear submarine base in 1960, on national television in 1962, and again at a mass demonstration in Union Square in 1965. Brothers Dan and Phil Berrigan, who began writing for the paper early in the 1960s, quickly moved to pouring blood on draft files, then burning them with napalm in the Catonsville Nine action of 1968.¹⁶

Dorothy Day responded to such actions by suggesting that destruction of property was not truly nonviolent, and reminding readers of Peter Maurin’s conviction that “the works of mercy are the most direct form of action there is.”¹⁷ Still, the close association between the Catholic Worker and the Berrigans’ “ultra resistance” contributed enormously to the proliferation of Worker houses. Jonah House, the Baltimore community founded by Phil Berrigan and Liz McAlister, was not officially a Worker house because it did not do

hospitality, but the Berrigans' friends Willa Bickham and Brendan Walsh started Viva House Catholic Worker to provide hospitality for war resisters and others in need. Mike Cullen, founder of Milwaukee's Casa Maria Catholic Worker House, was deported after he and Jim Forest participated in an action modeled on that of the Catonsville Nine. Other Worker houses that were close to the Berrigans include Boston's Haley House, the Ammon Hennacy House of Hospitality in Los Angeles, and the Des Moines Catholic Worker, whose cofounder Frank Cordaro has declared that "we're not afraid to call the Berrigan brothers, Dan and Phil, our Rabbis and Jonah House the Mother House of US faith-based resistance to war and the ways of war."¹⁸ Several of the communities founded during this period evolved into regional "motherhouses," instilling Worker values in young people who would go on to found new houses in dozens of cities. Ironically, at a time when many observers viewed the Worker as an "outdated idea" that was being supplanted by liberation theology, it was on the verge of an era of explosive growth.

That growth came in the 1980s. The Reagan-era cuts to federal housing programs, coupled with the deinstitutionalization of persons with mental illnesses, created a national crisis of homelessness and gave new relevance to the work of hospitality. Increasingly, houses of hospitality popped up in such small cities as Worcester, Massachusetts, or Winona, Minnesota, as well as in major metropolitan areas. Simultaneously, Reagan's Central America policies generated a stream of refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala, and other Workers were formed as part of the "Overground Railroad" that helped these refugees en route to Canada. Some of the new communities shared the movement's strong commitment to antiwar activism, while others evolved into more conventional homeless shelters whose tax-exempt status limited their activism. Dorothy Day's 1980 death and subsequent canonization process also gave important publicity to the movement. Her autobiography, *The Long Loneliness*, was soon one of the most widely assigned books at Catholic colleges, and at least a few houses were founded by people who had no previous exposure to the movement except through books.

From the 1940s onward, Dorothy Day and the New York Worker responded enthusiastically to the growth but were careful to let each new community chart its own path. They used the newspaper to share the movement's stories: anecdotes about hospitality, hagiographies of saints whose actions resonated with Worker ideals, and memories of such Catholic Worker "saints" as Maurin, Hennacy, and eventually Day herself. Occasional *Worker* columns might also admonish local leaders to attend daily Mass or establish certain "departments," but no attempt was ever made to weed out those who

failed to comply. The New York paper also published and republished so many versions of the movement's "Aims and Ideals" or "Positions" that none could be regarded as absolutely normative, though any one could be borrowed (sometimes with extensive editing) by a new house wishing to explain itself to potential supporters.¹⁹

A hallmark of all such attempts to "define" the Catholic Worker is the (frequently humorous) acknowledgment that definition is impossible. "Ammon Hennacy," recalled a statement produced by the Austin house and reprinted by others, "often said that Catholic Workers usually are neither (Catholic nor Worker). That's a pretty good start! Anyone can call themselves a Catholic Worker, and many do." Perhaps the most popular introduction to the movement today is a cartoon produced by Chuck Trapkus in which the history and ideals of the movement are related to various school subjects. Under "Social Studies," for example, Trapkus wrote that "the Big Idea behind the CW is PERSONALISM: being personally *responsible* for everybody else's problems." But if precise definition is impossible, most Worker communities could endorse the list of four core values identified by Duluth's Loaves and Fishes Catholic Worker: hospitality, resistance, community, and spirituality.²⁰

"Hospitality," said Carla Dawson of the Des Moines Catholic Worker, "means if somebody comes in and they need something to eat, or they need a shower, or they need a cup of coffee, or they need to use the phone or they need to use this as their address, we have it or we let them use those things." Put differently, hospitality means practicing the "works of mercy" outlined in Matthew 25, which the movement has consistently sought to revive. Some Catholic Workers provide overnight accommodations while others offer only a meal and a space to hang out during the day; some open their doors to all comers, while others limit themselves in order to attend more closely to each individual. But virtually all would agree that hospitality is work that everyone should do (albeit in a variety of ways), and that it should take place in one's own living space rather than in specialized shelters or institutions dependent on what Day called "Holy Mother the State." Catholic Worker hospitality, explained Tom Heuser of Saint Catherine of Genoa Catholic Worker, is "not so much focused on rehabilitating and fixing, looking at people as problems to be fixed, but rather people to be celebrated and embraced, and to journey with." Ironically, Catholic Workers do not always take sufficient credit for the fact that this spirit has now spread to many state-funded shelters and drop-in centers.

"Resistance" is an umbrella term for the many ways in which Catholic Workers oppose war and systems of injustice. Many Catholic Workers stress

confrontational tactics: massive demonstrations, civil disobedience at weapons facilities, sabotage of weapons, tax resistance. A few choose to write letters to their legislators or even run for office themselves. (Given the Worker's tradition of anarchism, election-time newsletters often feature debates about the pros and cons of voting.) Perhaps most significantly, Catholic Worker newsletters and roundtable discussions introduce the full range of peace and justice issues—the war in Iraq, the ongoing dangers of the American nuclear arsenal, genocides in Sudan or Rwanda, the debate over women's ordination—to ordinary people whose first motivation may have simply been to share a casserole with the homeless.

Perhaps the most defining feature of the Catholic Worker is the conviction that hospitality and resistance are, in Donna Howard's words, "mutually empowering." "The balance between those two," she explained, "made each one possible for me. I was able to go further with each one because of the other." When she stood trial for a Plowshares Action in which she damaged a radio system for communication with nuclear-armed submarines, Donna could talk about sharing her home with persons experiencing homelessness, and about her dream that the millions of dollars spent every day preparing for war might be redirected to human needs. And when she spent time in the kitchen at the Loaves and Fishes Catholic Worker, she learned to love both likeable and unlikeable people, honing the nonviolent skills she needed to confront the war-makers of the world.

The place where hospitality and resistance, charity and justice come together is of course community. Most Workers can resonate with the closing words of Dorothy Day's autobiography, in which she wrote that "it all happened while we sat there talking," suggesting the roots of hospitality and resistance in human relationships. Many, moreover, share her fondness for the Catholic doctrine that the whole church, and indeed the whole of humanity, comprises the Mystical Body of Christ. "We cannot go to Heaven alone," Dorothy Day insisted. "Otherwise, as Péguy said, God will say to us, 'Where are the others?'"²¹

Finally, Catholic Workers place strong emphasis on the spiritual sources for hospitality, resistance, and community. "The vision is this," wrote Dorothy Day in 1940. "We are working for 'a new heaven and a new *earth*, wherein justice dwelleth.' We are trying to say with action, 'Thy will be done on *earth* as it is in heaven.' We are working for a Christian social order." This vision continues to be fleshed out in ways that are both broadly inclusive and specifically Catholic. "The leaders of the work," Day sometimes insisted, "must go daily to Mass, to receive food for the soul."²² To this day, daily Mass-goers work side by side in

many Catholic Worker houses with Jews, Buddhists, or spiritual seekers, drawn together by the common conviction that hospitality, resistance, and community are integral aspects of any authentic spiritual path.

These shared values leave room for considerable diversity. Theologically, there are Worker communities that promote an almost Tridentine spirituality, Workers that seek to combine theological orthodoxy with political radicalism, Workers that participate enthusiastically in liberal Catholic movements like Call to Action, and Workers that are more Buddhist than Catholic. Structurally, there are Workers dominated by a charismatic founder, Workers in which a central couple provides leadership and stability, Workers that are informal networks of families with distinct projects of hospitality, Workers that are controlled by volunteers who do not live at the house at all, and Workers sponsored by a religious order or even a university. Catholic Worker houses have specialized in care for adults with AIDS, babies with AIDS, single mothers, drug addicts, refugees, and sex workers; there are Catholic Worker farms that function as rural houses of hospitality, others that serve primarily as retreat houses, and still others that combine intensive farming and advocacy on rural issues. There are communities that call themselves “Protestant Catholic Workers” or “in the Catholic Worker tradition,” as well as countless people who, inspired by previous Catholic Worker experiences, provide regular hospitality without declaring any identity at all. The challenges of this diversity were poignantly expressed in my conversation with Matt Daloisio, whom I met at Boston’s Haley House in 2002. Characterizing the community there as predominantly Buddhist, Matt said he longed for a place that would nurture his Catholic spirituality more directly. But, he added, “How boring would it be if we all looked like the New York Catholic Worker.” “The genius of the anarchist movement is that . . . it doesn’t allow all of us to look the same.” In all their diverse “looks,” Catholic Workers have found hundreds of ways to engage and transform the larger society.

Camphill

Most Camphillers would readily agree that communities that wish to touch the world should not all “look the same.” They would also agree with a principle that Dorothy Day referred to as the “primacy of the spiritual”: a vital community movement must have a solid foundation in transcendent reality. One of the central challenges of the Camphill movement is thus to keep its diverse expressions connected to the original spiritual vision of founder Karl König.

König was an ethnic Jew who lived in Vienna on the eve of the Holocaust, a pediatrician with a special interest in neonatal development, and a student of the spiritual science of Rudolf Steiner, also known as anthroposophy. Each of these biographical facts influenced the community movement he initiated on a rural Scottish estate named Camphill in 1940. König's earliest companions were members of an anthroposophical study circle who had coordinated their flights from Austria at the time of Hitler's annexation. From the beginning, they understood Camphill as both a place of refuge and a "morsel of the true European destiny" that had been nearly destroyed by Hitler. Their experience as refugees made it easy for them to embrace König's desire to work with handicapped children who were "refugees from a society which did not want to accept them as part of their community." But from the beginning, the vision of Camphill was broader than the task of "curative education." The "brotherhood" of coworkers, modeled on earlier communities such as the Rosicrucians and Moravians, aspired to become the seed of a "new social order" rooted in the insights of Steiner's anthroposophy.²³

Anthroposophy can be best understood as a strand of Christian esotericism; it places primary emphasis on the inner development of spiritual knowledge and capacities rather than on such outward expressions as doctrines and church institutions. Typically, esoteric traditions have also articulated complex theories of "correspondences" between heaven and earth, and between the natural cosmos and the human microcosm, sometimes incorporating notions of reincarnation and astrology. Esotericism has always been a part of Christianity, but there is a long history of conflict between Christian esotericists and doctrinally oriented churches such as Catholicism. Only in the modern era have esotericists been free to publicize the fruits of their spiritual researches, even as they insist that the deepest levels of spiritual knowledge are accessible only to the initiated.²⁴

Rudolf Steiner, an Austrian born in 1861, was one of the most important shapers of this modern, semipublic strand of Christian esotericism. Trained in both science and literature, he came to esoteric spirituality in part through his work editing Goethe's scientific works and in part through a series of childhood encounters with unusual spiritual phenomena. For a time he found a spiritual home in the Theosophical Society, but his interest in Christian esotericism clashed with the Theosophists' emphasis on Eastern religion. In 1913 his followers organized the Anthroposophical Society; Steiner re-founded this under his personal leadership a decade later. Also in 1913, Steiner began building the Goetheanum in Dornach, Switzerland. This massive, highly distinctive building, rebuilt after a fire on New Year's Eve

1921–2, continues to serve as global headquarters for the wide-ranging “initiatives” of anthroposophy.

Steiner’s presentation of anthroposophy had two primary aspects. First, he articulated a complex theory of human nature and taught a series of spiritual exercises that would allow any person to develop his or her spiritual capacities. From this perspective, the heart of anthroposophy is a spiritual practice that can be freely undertaken by any individual, regardless of his or her abilities in other dimensions of life. In my interviews with Camphillers who embrace anthroposophy as their spiritual path, many highlighted Steiner’s view of human nature as the key to his relevance for both community building and work with persons with developmental disabilities. What “makes a lot of sense to me,” explained Jan Zuzalek of Camphill Village Minnesota, “is that the person isn’t just a physical being, that there’s something more and you’re always trying to . . . bring out the gifts of that person.”

The second aspect of Steiner’s spiritual science involved his effort to apply the results of his own spiritual “researches” to concrete human problems. “There are very many people who’ve been clairvoyant and can tell things in the spiritual world,” explained Richard Neal of Camphill Copake. “Those are usually experiences that are wonderful for the person who has them, but don’t translate into a lot of real life help or opening of paths for people who hear of them.” Steiner’s gift was that “he was able to . . . translate spiritual experiences into an earthly form that people who didn’t have that experience could work with.” Often, Steiner made these “translations” in response to specific requests for help. When he was asked to help educate employees’ children at the Waldorf Astoria Tobacco Factory in Stuttgart, he developed a program of education that grew into the worldwide movement of Waldorf schools. Christian ministers drawn to anthroposophy persuaded Steiner to create rituals for the Christian Community, or Movement for Religious Renewal. Steiner offered eurythmy, a form of symbolic movement, to dancers, while requests from farmers led him to develop biodynamic agriculture, which combines organic principles with astrological and homeopathic techniques for revitalizing the soil. Perhaps the two most significant fruits of spiritual research for Camphill are Steiner’s method of “curative education” and his social theory, usually known as “threefolding.”

Steiner developed his model of “curative education” through his early experience as a tutor for a hydrocephalic boy and his long-term collaboration with the Dutch physician Ita Wegman. At its heart is the idea that the caregiver must attend to the whole person, rather than merely the symptoms that need “fixing.” Like Catholic Worker “personalism,” curative education places

strong emphasis on the healing power of reciprocal relationships between persons. "Simply the meeting, eye to eye, of two persons," wrote König near the end of his life, "creates that curative education which counters, in a healing way, the threat to our inner humanity."²⁵ Camphillers are quick to note that "curative education" is always a two-way street. "I would say a lot of people looking at this would say it's important because we're helping the person with special needs," noted Douglas Elmquist, who grew up in Camphill and now lives at a related community called Community Homestead. "My feeling . . . is that [there is] a balancing between who's helping who. I would not be the person I am today without the people with special needs."

In Camphill schools, the practice of curative education is embodied most fully in the "college meeting," at which all the persons concerned with the development of a child gather to reflect on that child's biography and current circumstances, in order that by recognizing "the child's individual nature" they will also "realize the necessary curative and educational treatment." This practice, which König identified as one of three "pillars" of Camphill, is a therapeutic discipline that requires intense spiritual preparation.²⁶ "It's a serious moment," explained Lois Smith, "where you're really looking to the angel of the child and the child's higher being to really speak with you." The results of this reverent attention can be both swift and profound, Lois added. "You meet the child in person, often the next day, and you're just in awe." Though college meetings are not held as consistently today as they were in Camphill's early years, in some ways the model has expanded to cover other circumstances: Camphill Beaver Run has held a "college meeting on the land," while Camphill Minnesota occasionally convenes a special group to help a coworker with a personal crisis or vocational discernment.

Steiner's vision of the "threefold social order" built on a correspondence between the esoteric anthropology of body, soul, and spirit and the French revolutionary principles of fraternity, equality, and liberty. According to Steiner, each principle corresponds to a distinct social sphere. Fraternity applies to the material, economic, or bodily sphere, in which all of us have a responsibility to care for one another's daily needs. Equality is the cardinal value in the political or "soul" sphere of decision-making, in which it is vitally important that each person has an equal voice. And it is in the spiritual sphere (that for Steiner also includes education) that individual freedom can be fully realized. Neither economic nor political institutions should be allowed to exercise any coercion in matters of the spirit. The great evil of fascism (that Steiner foretold in part) was the way it collapsed the economic, political, and spiritual spheres into its own totalitarian system. Camphill, in response, has

honored the distinctions by refusing to impose any religious or spiritual tests on its members, by making everyday decisions democratically (in many cases by consensus), and by eschewing individual salaries and practicing an ethos of mutual care. This last practice grows out of Steiner's "fundamental social law," frequently quoted within Camphill: "The welfare of a group of people who work together is the better the less the single person claims for himself the profit of his labours."²⁷

Karl König's application of Steiner's ideas to the life of Camphill reflected his own experiences as a second-generation anthroposophist who just missed the opportunity to meet Steiner in person. But Camphill is much more than the outgrowth of one man's vision. From the beginning other persons, as well as external social factors, have shaped the movement in profound ways—as well as occasionally causing great personal struggles for its founder. One significant early factor was the fact that König and his male associates were sent to internment camps almost immediately after their arrival in Great Britain, just as the fledgling community was offered the use of the Camphill estate. The women were thus the true "founders" of Camphill. When König was released from the camp, he was "returning to the mainstream of his life and activity," but not truly returning to Camphill because "he had not yet been in Camphill, and the life there was at first strange to him."²⁸

Upon his return, König concentrated on forging the circle of coworkers into an esoteric brotherhood comparable to the medieval Templars who had first settled the Camphill estate. This process, in which König acted as a spiritual father and teacher, involved lectures, discussion, and participation in both the sacraments of the Christian Community and a new ritual called the Bible evening, at which participants shared a Saturday evening meal and then reflected together on the connections between a Bible reading and their experiences of the past week. These activities, coupled with the intense labors of building up a new enterprise, forged what became known as the Camphill Community.

The process also generated tensions. Several of the core members of the old Viennese youth group chafed under König's overpowering leadership, then left to start their own school for curative education, known as Garvald. At the same time, the work of Camphill attracted new members who were not prepared to participate in the shared spiritual disciplines of the "inner community." The result was an extended process of "social differentiation," in which the "Camphill Community" of persons devoted to Camphill's spiritual vision was distinguished from such outward administrative bodies as "Camphill Rudolf Steiner Schools Ltd." that carried administrative respon-

sibility for the work of curative education. Though many of the same individuals were prominent in both groups, the differentiation made space, in König's words, for those "who feel themselves to belong to the impulse [of Camphill] but who wish to find a freer, less binding form for their lives."²⁹

The process of social differentiation went hand in hand with the creation of new schools and villages. The earliest of these were on neighboring Scottish estates. Newton Dee, for example, was purchased in 1945 to provide a home for a group of delinquent boys. This was the first step in broadening Camphill's mission beyond work with children with developmental disabilities. A few years later, small clusters of coworkers, including Tilla König, began planting new schools in England. Camphill schools came to South Africa in 1951, Northern Ireland in 1953, and Germany in 1958. Soon König began reflecting on the future of those Camphill graduates who were still unable to find a valued place in the larger society. Their challenge, he realized, dovetailed with society's own need for a revitalization of village life. "Around each of our houses," he wrote in a 1952 report, "a very small village should grow with four or five small houses occupied by a few families finding their place in life and work."³⁰ This vision was realized in 1955, when Botton Village was established in northern England as the first Camphill community for adults with disabilities. Today, Botton Village is the largest Camphill community in the world, and villages for adults are as numerous in the international movement as schools for children.

Though the pattern of life is similar at the schools and the villages, village coworkers are careful to respect the adulthood of the developmentally disabled "villagers." Typically, they speak of their work as "social therapy" or "lifesharing," rather than "curative education," and they emphasize the rhythms of daily life more than intense interventions like the college meeting. König himself warned that a clinical attitude toward adult villagers would mean that "we would then become their gaolers and they would be our prisoners."³¹ Lois Smith, who has lived at both schools and villages, explained that at the schools, "there is a lot more effort . . . to help the child transform and to become everything that he or she can become," while in the villages "we *have* become."

The move to adult villages in turn sparked more dramatic expansions of Camphill's mission, as some communities undertook work with persons experiencing mental illness or drug addiction, and others suggested that Camphill might become "a place of hospitality for other impulses that were in need of support." It also sparked a series of changes, some of them painful, in König's leadership. Deluged with requests for help from new initiatives,

König declared that he needed “a period of freeing myself somewhat from Camphill” in Scotland. In 1957 he delegated his administrative responsibilities to his associate Thomas Weihs, and reorganized the inner Community so as to renounce all personal authority over his companions. After a decade of shepherding the international “Movement Council,” König withdrew again from direct leadership, handing authority over to six regional councils in 1964. König spent the last years of his life at the German village of Brachenreute, on the shores of Lake Constance. Finally at home in his native region, he devoted himself to tracing what he saw as his karmic connections to the history of central Europe, and reflecting on the spiritual meaning of his Jewish identity in light of both anthroposophical Christianity and the Holocaust.³²

It was during this period of transition in König’s leadership that Camphill first came to the United States, though in a sense its roots here go back even further than those in Scotland. The first American community initiative rooted in anthroposophy was the Threefold Community in Spring Valley, New York. Founded in 1926, this community embodied “threefolding” ideals through a variety of initiatives that have included an anthroposophical college, a biodynamic research center, and a retirement village structured somewhat like a Camphill. A more direct progenitor of Camphill in North America was the school for special needs children, coupled with a biodynamic farm, that Gladys and Bill Hahn established in 1938, first in Dover Plains, New York, and then at Sunny Valley Farm in Copake, New York. In 1954 the pressure of burdensome state regulations led the Hahns to relocate to Downingtown, Pennsylvania. There they received support from Alaric and Mabel Pew Myrin, wealthy anthroposophists with a special interest in biodynamic agriculture. By the time the Hahns were ready for retirement, they were familiar with Camphill’s work in curative education, and they invited Karl König to consider taking over the work. Around the same time, they learned that Sunny Valley Farm had been purchased by another anthroposophist, Toni Roothbert, who was eager to offer it for the use of a new initiative.

The first clusters of Camphillers sent to North America thus encountered a lively network of sympathetic friends, with access to suitable properties in both New York and Pennsylvania. They also found a strong network of parents, many of them Jews who sympathized with Camphill’s refugee roots, who were eager to place their disabled children in noninstitutional settings. Such widespread support allowed Camphill to launch villages for adults and children simultaneously: Camphill Village USA (often called Camphill Copake) was located at Sunny Valley Farm, while Camphill Special

School found its permanent home at Beaver Run, Pennsylvania. Carlo Pietzner, a member of the original Vienna youth group, was designated as leader of the North American region, and the new villages were pioneered by Janet McGavin, Hartmut and Gerda von Jeetze with their large family, Hubert and Helen Zipperlen, Mary and Asger Elmquist, as well as Pietzner's wife Ursel and sister-in-law Renate Sachs.

These Europeans were joined by such artistically inclined Americans as the architect Joan Allen and the poet and potter M. C. Richards. By the late 1960s, the trickle of new Camphillers became a tide, as both communities were well positioned to receive the hippies and searchers of the youth counterculture. Though these young Americans were rarely familiar with anthroposophy and had trouble connecting to the formalism of European culture, many found their life's work at Camphill. "It was quite a culture shock, a culture revelation," recalled Bernie Wolf, who came to Beaver Run as a practicum student from Antioch College in 1969. But the combination of cooperation, spiritual study, and meaningful work, coupled with his "deep admiration for the carrying coworkers," inspired him to return after his graduation, and soon he "settled in with no specific leaving date." "Most of the young people who came were looking for something," added Kristin Wilson, who as a Copake staff child was somewhat younger than the hippie generation. "Looking for something and a lot of them found it." The newcomers made American habits of informality and egalitarianism more fully a part of Camphill life, even as the founding generation rejoiced at the support of so many who were able to commit themselves freely to the work.

They also provided the North American region with sufficient strength to begin launching new initiatives, spearheaded both by veteran Camphillers and by local leaders interested in better care for people with disabilities. Today the North American region includes adult villages in California, Minnesota, British Columbia, and Ontario, youth guidance schools (for people in their late teens and early twenties) in New York and Pennsylvania, and several communities in the process of formation.

In each of these places, the evolving distinction between an inner "Camphill Community" and a more inclusive "Camphill Movement" has allowed Camphill to embody the ideals of threefolding while resolving the paradox that those ideals simultaneously mandate spiritual freedom and are themselves dependent on the specific spiritual insights of anthroposophy. North American Camphills are legally incorporated as 501(c)(3) nonprofits, and official authority is vested in boards of directors that include long-term coworkers, representatives of other Camphills, parents of the disabled children or

“villagers,” social workers, and civic leaders from nearby towns. These directors recognize that, except in times of crisis, real decision-making power rests with the “full circle” of long-term coworkers. Most “executive directors” downplay their own authority—indeed, I had spent at least two summers living at Camphill Minnesota before I realized that it had an executive director! At Beaver Run the board even agreed to invest the powers of the executive director in the Focus Group, which in turn seeks simply to “focus” issues for decision by a larger circle of coworkers. In each Camphill place, members of the inner Camphill Community have no legal power but carry the spiritual responsibility for ensuring that Camphill remains faithful to its founding vision. Should the coworkers decide to stop caring for persons with special needs, for example, the Community members would step in to block the change. More commonly, Community members simply identify areas of concern and then address them in individual ways.

As a result of the shared work of both the Camphill Community and the Camphill Association of North America (inheritor of the coordinating role once played by Carlo Pietzner), Camphill is significantly more cohesive than the Catholic Worker. The movement is marked by an easily recognizable architectural style, a standard daily schedule, and common mealtime prayers—despite the minor rift between those who say “May the meal be blessed” and those who say “Blessings on the meal.” Karl König may have declared that “the Camphill Movement is no trade-mark,” but new communities must still undergo an extended process of mutual discernment before affiliating formally with the Association.³³

Still, each community takes pride in its individuality. When Camphillers found a new community, they do extensive research on local history and ecology, and incorporate local touches into the architecture and the names of buildings. They are attentive to the differences between a pioneering community with just a few houses and a grand village such as Copake, with its roughly 250 members, or the even larger Botton Village in the United Kingdom, with several independent neighborhoods and its own post office. Different Camphills also relate very differently to local social welfare authorities. When the state of New York refused to send its students to the unaccredited school at Beaver Run, its leaders moved quickly to provide teachers with formal credentials. Kimberton Hills responded to a similar challenge by “very actively working not to be licensed.” Yet there was little resulting acrimony between the communities; indeed, Kimberton’s Helen Zipperlen suggested that the difference simply reflected the distinction between a school and an adult village. “The finished product from the work of Beaver Run is

an educated child. The finished product from here is something which is woven or milked or whatever. . . . We're licensed to sell raw milk and there's an inspector who comes to see that we do it properly."

Accidental factors also contribute to the differences among communities. Camphill Copake is shaped by the Jewish backgrounds of many of its villagers, as well as by its access to the cultural life of New York City, where it has held high profile musical benefits. Camphill Village Minnesota, on the other hand, is in isolated Todd County, far from other anthroposophical initiatives. Without a Waldorf School to attract anthroposophically inclined families, it has struggled to maintain a critical mass of long-term coworkers. But its greater independence from the larger anthroposophical movement has made it appealing to spiritual seekers and individuals whose primary attraction is to sustainable agriculture. It has also recognized the need to connect with local efforts to revitalize the rural economy. The new community hall, for example, includes a processing kitchen large enough to be used by a local farmers' cooperative (staffed by former Camphiller Kristin Wilson) and other neighbors. One of those who took up their offer, intriguingly enough, was a former Catholic Worker named Gary Brever, who had just launched Plough Share organic farm a few miles away.

Such initiatives reflect a growing awareness throughout the Camphill movement that the basic Camphill model may need to be adapted to allow for greater interaction with the larger society. Many compare Camphill to a plant that needed a certain amount of isolation in its germinal stages, but now requires greater exposure to light and air. In some places this means opening village facilities up to the broader public; in other places it means moving the community itself into more densely populated areas. At Camphill Kimberton Hills, for example, outsiders can eat at the café, shop at the craft shop or "Bring and Buy" thrift store, purchase a share in the large Community Supported garden, enroll their children in the Waldorf kindergarten, fulfill court-mandated community service, or even live at one of several rental properties maintained on site.

Camphill Houses in Stourbridge, England, on the other hand, was created as an urban alternative to the isolation of Botton Village. Villagers and coworkers live in houses within a conventional neighborhood, and many are employed outside Camphill. Some villagers even live in independent apartments, and meet the community only for the Saturday Bible evening.³⁴ The North American region has not moved nearly as far in this direction, but Camphill Beaver Run sponsors a "transitional program" for students ages 19–21 who live in two houses midway between the village and a nearby town.

Camphill Kimberton Hills has also spun off a few initiatives that are now fully part of the larger community; these include a natural foods store, a community action group for persons with disabilities, and two homes for persons with mental illness.

At the same time, a few Camphillers caution that large villages also have the capacity to touch the world in profound ways. “There’s a growing tendency within the Camphill movement,” said Copake’s Peter Madsen, “to go into the world as opposed to retreating from it.” But village life, Peter countered, provides a “social laboratory” because it has “a level of intensity that most people aren’t familiar with.” This laboratory is open to all sorts of people besides the full-time residents: the parents of villagers, the employees who work in the office, the extended family of coworkers. These people may be challenged to change their own lives by seeing a fully developed alternative. In an era when more Americans live in prison than on farms, Peter added, true villages have an important role to play in “revitalizing rural life.”

Even as this fruitful debate goes on within Camphill, many creative adaptations of the Camphill model exist just outside the official movement. Some of these can trace their roots to curative education projects that predated Camphill, or to Garvald, the Scottish school and village founded by members of the Vienna youth group who broke with König in 1943. In North America, however, most unaffiliated communities have some ties to Camphill. Community Homestead in Osceola, Wisconsin, was started by a cluster of friends who had lived at Camphill Copake as children or young adults; for them, partial independence from the movement has allowed them to return to their roots while honoring their subsequent life paths. The Cadmus Lifesharing Association is a cluster of autonomous households initiated by a family that had spent many years at Camphill Beaver Run. And the founders of Innisfree Village perhaps took König’s comment that Camphill is not a trademark too seriously, for their original name was Camphill Potomac. After a conversation with the Camphill Association revealed their admiration for Camphill but lack of interest in anthroposophy, they amicably agreed to a name change. It is also significant that the inner “Camphill Community” includes many members who no longer live at Camphill places, some of whom are now seeking to bring the spirit of Camphill into new initiatives or more conventional careers. Indeed, as Karl König declared, all the “single people who work in the spirit of the Movement and who feel united with it” are part of Camphill.³⁵

One can find a full spectrum of Camphill variations in the small town of Temple, New Hampshire, located about a two hours’ drive from Boston.

This area, which has been a hotbed of anthroposophical activity since the founding of High Mowing Waldorf School in 1942, hosts at least five distinct initiatives working with persons with special needs, three of which I had the opportunity to visit in 2002. By far the largest is the Lukas Community, a village of four or five households. Lukas was founded in 1981 by a group of parents whose children had lived at Camphill Beaver Run, but then failed to find a suitable placement at one of the North American Camphills for adults. Though Lukas undoubtedly has the “look” and “feel” of a Camphill, it has gone a bit further than many Camphills in adopting practices from the larger nonprofit world. It has an extremely clear focus on its mission of providing good care for special-needs persons that has caused it to limit its involvement in biodynamic agriculture. Though Lukas coworkers do not receive formal salaries, they are entitled to retirement benefits, eight weeks annual vacation, and two days a week entirely free of community responsibilities. (Camphill, by contrast, is only just beginning to develop a retirement strategy, and vacations are determined communally in response to individual needs.) They also are given semiprivate apartments with separate kitchens—an arrangement, according to executive director David Spears, that enhances the sense of community because coworkers are confident they can find private space when they need it.

If Lukas provides an alternative to Camphill that is slightly more like a traditional nonprofit, the other Temple communities tend in the direction of private-family homes. The Four Winds community, for example, maintains just two households, though it aspires to grow larger. Maple Hill Farm is a single household, and has no aspirations for growth. A history of schisms—the founders of Four Winds and Maple Hill initially separated from another community called Lyris, then split into two communities themselves—leads many folks in Temple to describe anthroposophy as inherently individualistic, but it also reflects a preference for the intimate scale of the household. Unlike Lukas, all these communities describe their work as “lifesharing,” and they seek to balance care for persons with special needs with other life goals, rather than to maintain a clear division between personal and communal life. All of these alternatives share with Camphill a spirit of welcoming that binds communities together even as it opens up their boundaries.

Transformative Presence

Each movement included in this study thus has a distinct history and a distinct character. It may be helpful, now, to take a step back and specify more

precisely the features they have in common, and the reasons they belong together in this book. Despite their differences, I would suggest, Camphill and the Catholic Worker share a community vision that balances egalitarianism with respect for differences, remains open to ongoing experimentation, and seeks to serve the larger society. Each has defined itself as Christian, while renouncing “sectarianism” and welcoming people from all religious traditions. Most fundamentally, each has practiced a discipline that I will call “transformative presence”—participating in the larger society in a way that opens new possibilities for others.

Both movements would affirm, in the strongest possible terms, that all people are equal in the eyes of God. For Karl König, the conviction that each person possesses an “eternal, imperishable” spiritual nature was “fundamental for our approach to the child. He is our brother and our sister. He is equal to every other human being and equal to us.” Camphillers resist the clinical categories used by psychologists and social workers, and struggle to soften the inevitable distinction between “villagers” and “coworkers.” The Catholic Worker, likewise, has always taken a fierce pride in its solidarity with even the so-called “undeserving poor,” and in one version of its “Positions” affirmed “the complete equality of all men as brothers under the Fatherhood of God.”³⁶

Each movement, moreover, has sought to embody egalitarian principles in its internal structures. Dorothy Day advocated the “Benedictine ideal,” in which leaders exercise a sensitive, quasi-parental authority, while many contemporary Workers aspire to either a formal or informal style of consensus decision-making. Camphills typically expedite the consensus process by distributing decision-making power among several individuals or groups, so that “we each have decision-making power where we work.” Only very important decisions require the consensus of the entire community. The resulting structure, noted Richard Neal of Camphill Copake, is more like a “horizontal net” than a hierarchical pyramid. “To my experience,” noted Bernie Wolf, “Beaver Run has never been led by any one or several people. It’s always been *our* Beaver Run.”

Neither movement has fully attained its egalitarian ideals. Despite Camphill’s attempts to deemphasize the role of “executive director,” it is significant that nearly all the people holding that position in North America have been men. Camphill work assignments also typically break down along gendered lines, primarily as a result of the choices and socialization of the people involved. Catholic Workers have a stronger culture of gender-neutral work, but both they and Camphill still attract a volunteer pool disproportionately white and middle-class in background.

Despite their commitment to egalitarianism, both movements have rejected the practice of community of goods, or holding all property in common. This may seem odd, in light of the fact that countless Christian communitarians have lifted up common property as the ultimate expression of equality. But Peter Maurin was fond of saying that property is “proper” to human beings. The Camphill practice of income-sharing is tantamount to community of goods for those individuals who come to Camphill as young adults with no property and stay indefinitely, but such people make up only a minority of Camphillers. Indeed, Camphillers who are independently wealthy are encouraged to take personal responsibility for the use or dispersal of their wealth, and not simply to hand it over to the community.³⁷

Such practices reflect a concern to honor genuine human differences. Camphills and Catholic Workers must take into account both the differences between long- and short-term volunteers and those distinguishing “guests” from “Workers” and “villagers” from “coworkers.” Many Catholic Workers can recall times when newcomers pushed for dramatic changes, then left as soon as the changes had been implemented. Efforts to involve guests more fully in decision-making have sometimes created a new hierarchy, in which the empowered “resident” guests exercise power over transient guests and those who only come for meals.³⁸ Similarly, Camphillers worry that giving decision-making authority to those with disabilities might give the more verbally skilled villagers an unfair advantage, or make villagers vulnerable to manipulation by the more charismatic coworkers.

At their best, Camphillers and Catholic Workers do not use the recognition of differences as an excuse for not empowering guests and villagers, but simply as the starting point for a discussion of more subtle ways of promoting egalitarianism. Several coworkers at Camphill Copake, for example, told me that they were working to create a “community meeting” at which villagers would be able to express their needs and preferences more fully. Having a public forum to express their concerns about staff kids riding their bicycles too fast, for example, could effect important changes even without formal democratic processes. Copakers have also recently expressed concern about the divisive effects of such labels as “villager” and “coworker,” and have even resolved to abolish the once-prestigious designations of “housemother” and “housefather.”³⁹ Place of Grace Catholic Worker in La Crosse, Wisconsin, similarly, has a policy that “if you want to volunteer here, you have to come here and eat first.” This serves as an important reminder that all of us are in need of hospitality and service.

The commitment to egalitarianism thus requires constant experimentation with community forms. The early Camphillers took a cautious, experimental

approach to implementing even such cherished principles as Steiner's Three-fold Social Order. "We first had to gather the experiences out of which a social order can arise in a living way through our lives together," recalled Anke Weihs. In keeping with the anthroposophical tradition of using analogies to human life stages, Karl König told the Botton Camphillers on their seventh anniversary that "we have toddled, we have played about, and in playing of course, nice things have begun to take shape."⁴⁰ Reba Mathern-Jacobson of Loaves and Fishes Catholic Worker observed similarly that "none of us grew up in a Catholic Worker house. . . . So we make it up as we go along and we get guidance from people who have walked this path before or who we are walking the path with."

Camphill and the Catholic Worker also share an emphasis on service. Indeed, they are often misperceived as service projects without a larger vision for social renewal. Yet even the manner in which they serve has been socially transformative. Largely because of Camphill, there is now a consensus among social workers that people with disabilities should not be warehoused in institutions but allowed to share their special gifts with the world. Similarly, hundreds of homeless shelters now aspire to meet the standard of hospitality set by the Worker. Camphillers Helen Zipperlen and Claus Sproll, for their own part, seek strong ties to other sorts of intentional communities to help prevent Camphill from being reduced to a mere service provider.

Service, obviously, is a way in which a community movement touches the world quite directly, changing the lives of individuals who receive a meal, a place to live, or acceptance despite their disabilities. But service also contributes to "touching the world" in more subtle ways. It brings dedicated communitarians into regular contact with individuals whose motives are "merely" charitable, or who have a personal reason for wanting to work with persons with disabilities. A service mission can help build esprit de corps, holding the members of a community together even during the hard times when they may not especially like one another. "I can't imagine a more unsound basis to start a community," noted Copake's Peter Madsen, than the desire to "live together and have a nice life. . . . But together with people in need of special care, the intentions gained greater depth." Catholic Workers quote similar sentiments from Catherine de Hueck Doherty or Jean Vanier, while Dorothy Day herself affirmed that "the one factor which has brought the most results, which has served most to hold a group together, is the performance together of the Works of Mercy."⁴¹ Without a service mission, communities often rely on coercive tactics or isolation from the larger society to build a sense of shared identity, thus depriving themselves of the opportunity to "touch the world."

The common commitment to service provides a clue to the distinctive understanding of Christian identity shared by the two movements. Many standard accounts of American community movements draw a broad distinction between “secular” communities like hippy communes and “religious” communities like the Shakers. Such classifications don’t work well for Camphill and the Catholic Worker, for while these movements have cast their work as an effort to build the “kingdom of God on earth,” they have refused to impose “sectarian” restrictions on individual members. A more helpful classification appears in the work of historian Seymour Kesten, who distinguished “colonies of individual salvation” from “colonies of social reorganization.” For the first group, the primary purpose of life in community is to achieve salvation from sin; some would even go so far as to say that salvation is not possible outside community. Such communities have little interest in “touching the world,” except insofar as this is part of the evangelistic project of persuading more people to follow the communal path to salvation. Kesten’s second group, who may or may not be motivated by religious faith, seeks to remedy such evils as “poverty, ignorance, and inequality” by changing the social system. In these terms, Camphill and the Catholic Worker can easily be classified as “colonies of social reorganization” that happened to draw their primary inspiration from the Christian Gospel. I will explore the implications of this in more detail in chapter 4.

Perhaps the best window into what I am calling “transformative presence” is a word that might separate the movements: “radicalism.” This is a favorite word among Catholic Workers, while for most Camphillers “radical” is “too loaded a term.” Indeed, some of the most negative responses I have received in interviews came from Camphillers who were troubled by my early use of “radical Christian communities” as an umbrella term for the two movements. And yet there are some interesting connections between the reasons some give for avoiding the term “radicalism” and the reasons others give for embracing it.

When Camphillers repudiate the language of “radicalism,” they usually have in mind an approach to social change that is either narrowly political or else overly “destructive.” But for Peter Maurin, “radical” meant finding “roots” deeper than conventional politics. “To be radically right,” he wrote in one Easy Essay, “is to go to the roots / by fostering a society / based on creed, / systematic unselfishness / and gentle personalism.” Such an approach would draw on “a philosophy so old / that it looks like new.” Most Catholic Workers would say that this “old philosophy” is the Gospel, especially the Sermon on the Mount. “The Catholic Worker *is* radical,” explained Anthony Novitsky, “primarily in the sense that any group trying to live literally the message of

the Sermon on the Mount is radical." Other Catholic Workers have explained that radicalism meant a "revolution from below" in which ordinary people would create new social structures rather than waiting on politicians. "We are to be announcers of a new social order and not denouncers of the old," declared Dorothy Day.⁴²

It is easy to find echoes of this slogan in Camphill rhetoric. "In the midst of strife and chaos, and the dissolution of social forms and values," wrote Wanda Root, Camphill's founders "wanted to create a new form of social life. They wanted to find a way to live together based on a new understanding of man, and the ideals of freedom, equality, and brotherhood." This vision owed much to König's early involvement in the Austrian socialist party of Gustav Landauer, who had promoted a "new spirit" of socialism that relied on personal transformation as well as state action. König was also mindful of the fact that when Rudolf Steiner had attempted to build the "threefold commonwealth" by conventional political means, he was blocked by opposition from both left and right. Camphill's alternative approach was to "appear in the mantle of the task of caring for the handicapped, of caring for the land, of doing social work. In this way we are nevertheless able . . . to sow tiny little seeds here and there in as many places as possible." "The aim," König added on another occasion, "is not to preach the threefold social order, but in a humble way, to learn to understand it."⁴³

Camphillers today continue to insist that social change begins with personal transformation. In explaining her discomfort with the word "radical," Lois Smith asked, "do I want to change society? I guess my first focus is to try to change myself. But I do believe that by changing myself, I can have a very strong effect on the rest of the world." Most Catholic Worker "radicals" would have little trouble accepting the premise that the personal transformation involved in personalist hospitality is the key to any meaningful social change.

This is not to suggest that the differences are purely semantic. Catholic Workers seek to "change themselves" by going to prison as well as by sharing their homes, while many Camphillers see such acts of "resistance" as an overly negative approach to social change. But insofar as Catholic Workers put hospitality before resistance, these differences are tactical rather than fundamental. The point is not to simply resist the injustices that make hospitality necessary but also to model one's resistance on one's hospitality. Some other anti-war groups, explained Joel Kilgour of Duluth's Loaves and Fishes Catholic Worker, will go to a military base and "point fingers at them and say that they [are] killers and potential killers." But the discipline of sharing his home with homeless persons, some of them likeable and some not, has helped him to remember

the goodness in all people, including those caught in the military machine. “I know that they’re good people. And we need to find that good in them and draw it out . . . and then always have room for them at our table.” From the perspective of their common commitment to constructive change, Camphillers and Catholic Workers have much to learn from one another: Camphillers might learn that resistance can be a part of a larger constructive strategy, while Catholic Workers can be reminded not to get totally absorbed in resistance.

The common ground between these movements is thus “transformative presence”—the idea that society changes when small groups of people begin living in a new way. Camphillers and Catholic Workers reject the idea of revolution “from above,” and refuse to use coercive methods—whether military or legislative—to get other people to change. Instead, they change their own lives in ways that do not cut themselves off from other people, and by so doing they make it easier for other people to change. The Catholic Worker, declared Frank Cordaro, does not live “away from the ‘City of Man’ in some sort of sectarian seclusion, but right in the very heart of man’s brokenness.”⁴⁴ And at Community Homestead, where the co-workers often work part-time in conventional careers, Richard Elmquist illustrated the principle from his own experience. “I work twenty hours a week, for a big defense contractor,” he said. “Quite often what people will say to me is, you’ve got a great life, I don’t know how you manage to make it work, I wish I could do that. I only work half time and yet I seem to be doing all right. . . . And my response to people when they say that is, you can do this too.”

The point, Richard quickly clarified, was not that everyone should live at Community Homestead, or even in intentional community. But by living creatively *in* the world, he and other community members call out the creativity of their neighbors. A common hope of Catholic Workers and Camphillers is that all people who come into contact with their communities will feel free to make new choices—to choose sharing and personal growth and reciprocal hospitality. Ultimately, the “kingdom of heaven on earth” to which both movements aspire is not a project to be built, but a seed that will grow only when it is planted in every human heart.

Notes

1. Marty Hunt, ed., *Shining Lights: Celebrating Forty Years of Community in Camphill Village* (Copake, NY: Camphill Village U.S.A., 2001) 115.

2. Peter Maurin, “A New Society,” *Easy Essays* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1977) 109.

3. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, *Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972).

4. Karl König, *The Camphill Movement*, 2d edition (Botton Village, U.K.: Camphill Books, 1993) 33.

5. Dorothy Day, *On Pilgrimage: The Sixties* (New York: Curtis Books, 1972) 171.

6. Day, *The Long Loneliness* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1997) 107; "Story of Three Deaths," *Catholic Worker* 16/2 (June 1949); and *Loaves and Fishes* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1983) 3–6.

7. Peter Maurin, *Easy Essays*, 110–1, xviii, 63; and "Easy Essays," *Catholic Worker* 1/2 (June–July 1933) 1.

8. "Catholic Workers' School Program 436 East 15th Street, N.Y.C.," *Catholic Worker* 1/8 (1 February 1934) 4; and "Catholic Worker Program of Action," *Catholic Worker* 3/4 (September 1935) 4.

9. Janice Brandon-Falcone, "Experiments in Truth: An Oral History of the St. Louis Catholic Worker, 1935–1942," in Patrick G. Coy, ed., *A Revolution of the Heart: Essays on the Catholic Worker* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988) 317, 319; Francis Sicius, "The Chicago Catholic Worker," in Coy, *Revolution of the Heart*, 339–40, 346–7; William D. Miller, *A Harsh and Dreadful Love: Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement* (New York: Liveright Publishing, 1973) 114; and Day, *Loaves and Fishes*, 42, 55.

10. Miller, *Harsh and Dreadful Love*, 115; Arthur G. Falls, "Chicago Letter," *Catholic Worker* 3/2 (June 1935) 8; *Catholic Worker* 5/7 (November 1937) 1–8; and "Houses of Hospitality," *Catholic Worker* 4/8 (December 1936) 4.

11. "Not Pacifism," *Catholic Worker* 2/6 (November 1934) 4; "Pacifism," *Catholic Worker* 4/1 (May 1936) 8; "Our Stand—An Editorial," *Catholic Worker* 7/9 (June 1940) 1; "Our Country Passes from Undeclared to Declared War; We Continue Our Christian Pacifist Stand," *Catholic Worker* 9/3 (January 1942) 1.

12. Day mentioned the burning of the papers in an interview with James Finn, *Protest: Pacifism and Politics: Some Passionate Views on War and Nonviolence* (New York: Random House, 1967) 375, and one Los Angeles Worker, E. Virginia Newell, apologized for the incident in a letter to Dorothy Day, 22 October 1940, Dorothy Day—Catholic Worker Collection, series W-4, box 1.

13. Dorothy Day to "Fellow Worker," 10 August 1940, Dorothy Day—Catholic Worker Collection, series W-1, box 1; and Catholic Worker Editors to "Fellow Workers in Christ," 12 December 1941, Dorothy Day—Catholic Worker Collection, series W-1, box 1.

14. Day, *The Long Loneliness*, 272.

15. See Judith Stoughton, *Proud Donkey of Schaerbeek: Ade Bethune, Catholic Worker Artist* (Saint Cloud, MN: North Star Press, 1988); and Fritz Eichenberg, *Works of Mercy* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1992).

16. Dorothy Day, "C. W. Editors Arrested in Air Raid Drill," *Catholic Worker* 23/1 (July–August 1956) 1; Karl Meyer, "What Is to Be Done?" *Catholic Worker* 28/8 (March 1962) 6; Francis Sicius, "The Chicago Catholic Worker," in Coy, *Revolution of the Heart*, 355; and Miller, *Harsh and Dreadful Love*, 227, 319, 334.

17. Day, *Loaves and Fishes*, xvii.

18. Frank Cordaro, "Twenty-Five Years—Reflections from a Co-Founder," *via pacis*, 25/2 (June 2001).

19. Dorothy Day, "Letter on Hospices," *Catholic Worker* 14/10 (January 1948) 2, 8; "Houses of Hospitality—Primacy of the Spiritual," *Catholic Worker* 48/1 (January–February 1982) 3; Stanley Vishnewski, "How to Open a House of Hospitality," *Catholic Worker* 32/4 (December 1965) 7; "Catholic Worker Celebrates 3rd Birthday; A Restatement of C. W. Aims and Ideals," *Catholic Worker* 4/1 (May 1936) 1; "Aims and Purposes," *Catholic Worker* 6/7 (January 1939) 7; "Aims and Purposes," *Catholic Worker* 6/8 (February 1939) 7; "Aims and Purposes," *Catholic Worker* 6/10 (May 1939) 5; "Aims and Purposes," *Catholic Worker* 7/6 (February 1940) 7; "Aims and Purposes," *Catholic Worker* 10/6 (May 1943) 4; [Robert Ludlow], "Catholic Worker

Positions," *Catholic Worker* 20/7 (February 1954) 2; [Ammon Hennacy], "Our Positions," *Catholic Worker* 21/10 (May 1955) 5, 7; [Tom Cain], "Aims, Purposes, Positions," *Catholic Worker* 22/4 (November 1955) 8; and [Katherine Temple], "Our Manifesto: The Sermon on the Mount," *Catholic Worker* 53/3 (May 1986) 3.

20. Lynn Goodman-Straus, "What Exactly Is a Catholic Worker Person or House, Anyway?" *The Catholic Worker—Saint Catherine of Genoa, Chicago*, 5/4 (August 1993) 6, reprinted from *Jeremiah's Stutter*, Mary House Catholic Worker, Austin, Texas; and Chuck Trapkus, "A Catholic Worker Primer," available at many Catholic Worker houses.

21. Dorothy Day, "Aims and Purposes," *Catholic Worker* 7/6 (February 1940) 7.

22. *Ibid.*

23. König, *Camphill Movement*, 14, 15, 16.

24. For more on esoteric Christianity, see Antoine Faivre and Jacob Needleman, eds., *Modern Esoteric Spirituality* (New York: Crossroad, 1992).

25. Karl König, *Camphill Brief*, Christmas 1965, in Christof-Andreas Lindenberg, "Karl König—a portrait," in Cornelius Pietzner, ed., *A Candle on the Hill: Images of Camphill Life* (Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press, 1990) 26.

26. König, *Camphill Movement*, 36; and Michael and Jane Luxford, *A Sense for Community: A Five Steps Research Paper 2003* (Whitby, U.K.: Camphill Books, 2003) 16–21.

27. Cited in König, *Camphill Movement*, 44.

28. Anke Weihs, *Fragments from the Story of Camphill, 1939/40* (Coleg Elidyr Press, 1992), Karl König Archive, cited in Hans Müller-Wiedemann, *Karl König: A Central-European Biography of the Twentieth-Century*, trans. Simon Blaxland-de Lange (Botton Village, U.K.: Camphill Books, 1996) 174–5.

29. Müller-Wiedemann, *Karl König*, 192–3.

30. Cited in Friedwart Bock, "The history and development of Camphill," in Pietzner, *A Candle on the Hill*, 53.

31. Karl König, *In Need of Special Understanding: Camphill Conferences on Living with Handicapped Adults* (Whitby, U.K.: Camphill Press, 1986) 16.

32. Peter Roth, cited by Andrew Hoy, "Alternativenie," *Village Echo* [Camphill Copake], 16 July 2004; and Müller-Wiedemann, *Karl König*, 274–85, 379–429.

33. König, *Camphill Movement*, 33.

34. Michael Luxford, "The English and Welsh region," in Pietzner, *Candle on the Hill*, 115, 118.

35. König, *Camphill Movement*, 33.

36. Karl König, "Camphill essentials," in Pietzner, *Candle on the Hill*, 30; and [Robert Ludlow], "Catholic Worker Positions," *Catholic Worker* 20/7 (February 1954) 2.

37. Michael and Jane Luxford, *A Sense for Community*, 27, 55.

38. This process is eloquently described in Harry Murray, *Do Not Neglect Hospitality: The Catholic Worker and the Homeless* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990) 154–5, 208, 248.

39. Roswitha Imegwu, "Workshop in Social Therapy," *The Village Echo* (4 February 2005).

40. Anke Weihs, cited in Müller-Wiedemann, *Karl König*, 175; and König, *In Need of Special Understanding*, 13–4.

41. Dorothy Day, Circular letter to "Fellow Workers in Christ," Dorothy Day—Catholic Worker Collection, series W-1, box 1.

42. Peter Maurin, "Yes! I Am a Radical!" *Catholic Worker* 3/10 (April 1936) 1; Novitsky, "Ideological Development," 35; [Robert Ludlow], "Catholic Worker Positions," *Catholic Worker* 20/7 (February 1954) 2; and Dorothy Day, cited in Miller, *Harsh and Dreadful Love*, 6–7.

43. Wanda Root, "Camphill Villages: A Way of Life," *Village Life*, 10–1; Müller-Wiedemann, *Karl König*, 53; König, *In Need of Special Understanding*, 180; and König, cited in Luxfords, *Sense for Community*, 12.

44. Frank Cordaro, "A Midrash of the Catholic Worker Positions, part 2," *via pacis* 1/3 (January 1977).